DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 068 CS 503 371

AUTHOR Wiemann, John M.; Widenmann, Sally J.
TITLE Self-Disclosure and Relational Control.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 22p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (31st, Minneapolis, MN, May 21-25, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Disclosure; *Individual Power; *Interaction Process Analysis; *Interpersonal Competence; *Interpersonal Relationship; Social Exchange Theory
IDENTIFIERS *Interpersonal Communication; *Self Disclosure

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to examine self-disclosure as a relational control strategy in speech communication. Conversations of seven married couples were coded using L. E. Rogers-Millar's Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme and a self-disclosure coding system developed for the study. A message-by-message comparison of the codes from the two systems produced the following results: (1) intimate self-disclosure messages were typified by a one-up control move, (2) messages that preceded self-disclosure were characterized by either one-down or one-up control moves, and (3) with respect to the transaction, intimate self-disclosure was characterized by one-down complementarity and competitive symmetry. These results indicate that self-disclosure operates as a relational control strategy, complementing the structural and paralinguistic features of conversation that are usually considered "relational level" markers. (Author/RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED202068

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND RELATIONAL CONTROL

John M. Wiemann and Sally J. Widenmann

University of California, Santa Barbara

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John M. Wiemann
Sally J. Widenmann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN, May 1981.

CS503371

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND RELATIONAL CONTROL

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine self-disclosure as a relational control strategy. Conversation of conjugal dyads were coded using the most common structural scheme (Rogers-Millar, 1979) and a self-disclosure coding system developed for this study. A message-by-message comparison of the codes from the two systems produced the following results: (1) Intimate self-disclosive messages are typified by a one-up control move; (2) Messages which precede self-disclosure are characterized by either one-down or one-up control moves; and (3) With respect to the transact, intimate self-disclosure is characterized by one-down complementarity and competitive symmetry. Self-disclosure operates as a relational control strategy, complementing the structural and paralinguistic features of conversation usually considered "relational level" markers.

SELF-DISCLOSURE AND RELATIONAL CONTROL

In the last several years the study of communication as a mechanism for establishing, maintaining and dispanding interpersonal relationships has attracted the attention of social scientists. Theorizing and research have addressed a variety of issues under the rubric relational communication, and one of the most prominent concerns has been that of control in relationships as outlined by Watzlawick, Beavin and Jackson (1967) and articulated by Brown (1965), Mark (1971), Millar and Rogers (1976), Rogers and Farace (1975), Sluzki and Beavin (1977) and others. Our purpose here is to further extend this line of work by examining another frequently-studied communication variable, self-disclosure, as a relational control strategy. As will be made clear in the following review, our approach is a departure from typical considerations of relational control in the interactional tradition (e.g., Watzlawick et al., 1967). Before proceeding to the study proper, we will review literature pertinent to the relational control/self-disclosure interface.

The Interactional View of Relational Control

Two interrelated aspects of Watzlawick et al.'s conceptualization of human communication are particularly pertinent here: that messages operate on at least two levels and that they may be characterized in terms of "control direction." Briefly, Watzlawick et al. propose that every message (communication exchange, in their terms) has both content (or report) and relational (or command) levels, such that the latter classifies the former. The relational level serves as the medium through which interactants communicate (usually implicitly) about their perceptions of themselves, each other and

their relationship, especially in terms of control.

Rogers and Farace (1975, p. 222) define relational control as those aspects of ". . . message exchange by which interactors reciprocally define the nature of their relative 'position' or dominance in their interaction. In popular terms the notion of being 'one-up' or 'one-down' indicates two examples or relational control." There are control aspects in any message exchange (cf. Brown, 1965; Millar & Rogers, 1976; Rogers & Farace, 1975; Schutz, 1958), and the pattern of messages gives meaning to the notion of control manuevers (control direction of a given message).

> One-up messages attempt to assert definitional rights; one-down messages request or accept the other's definition of the relationship; one-across leveling messages minimize asserting or accepting definitions. (Rogers-Millar, 1979, p. 2)[1]

This concept of "direction" is based on Watzlawick et al.'s assertion that all communication interchanges are either symmetrical or complementary; the former are characterized by equality, the latter by maximization of difference. In a complementary exchange, there are two different positions which participants may occupy: the superior or "one-up" position, and the inferior or "one-down" position. Each partner behaves in a fashion which presupposes and evokes dissimilar but appropriate behavior from the other.

Theorizing based on Watzlawick et al.'s content/relational conceptualization of communication suggests that interactants communicate their view of their relationships primarily at the "relational level." That is, relationships are defined, negotiated or characterized by the structure of what is said and the paralinguistic devices used in the saying (e.g., sarcasm), rather than through the content of the interaction. (Note the widely used coding scheme for control messages developed by Rogers-Millar [1979] as an indication of this emphasis.)

However, in describing the course a relationship takes over its life cycle and the characterization of that relationship at various points in the life cycle, researchers have typically focused on content issues, such as "intimacy" and "interdependence" rather than control (cf. Altman & Taylor, 1973; Davis, 1973; Knapp, 1977; Walker & Wright, 1978; Wright, 1978). Much of this work emphasizes content (messages) as much as, or more than, relational level meta-messages.

Altman and Taylor's (1973) theory of "social penetration" is based on the contention that increasingly intimate facets of the personality are opened up and made available as interpersonal relationships grow, moving from superficial to more intimate areas. Self-disclosure is the mechanism through which individuals make the facets of their personalities available and thus it is through the use of content (self-disclosive messages) that individuals define the nature of their relationship.

Based on this reasoning, if an individual is able to define her/his relationship through self-disclosure, then that individual is engaging in relational control via the content level and thus relational control is not accomplished only on the relational level through the manipulation of meta-messages. Taken together, these two lines of study suggest that self-disclosure is perhaps itself a control strategy, manifest at the content level while reflecting message structure at the relational level. A selective review of past research on self-disclosure provides supporting evidence.

Self-disclosure

Given the parameters suggested by Altman and Taylor (1973) and Cozby (1973), self-disclosure can be considered individuals' communication to one or more others of some personal information that they believe these others would be unlikely to acquire unless they (the disclosers) personally reveal it. That is, people voluntarily tell another something about themselves which the other is unlikely to know or discover from other sources.

Past examinations of self-disclosure indicate that the content of

disclosures is tightly linked with the structure of messages in such a way that the content (disclosure) moves the relationship forward or backward in much the same way that structural characteristics influence relational definition. When such variables as topic of disclosure, characteristics of the disclosure recipient, and the relationship between discloser and recipient are considered, the contribution of both message and meta-message to relational control becomes evident.

The topic of disclosure, not surprisingly, contains information about the relational level. The content indicates how the participants see themselves (Fitzgerald, 1963; Jourard & Lasakow, 1958), each other (Gilbert & Whiteneck, 1976; Pederson & Higbee, 1969; Shapiro, Krauss & Truax, 1976), and most importantly their relationship with the recipient (Fitzgerald, 1963; Gilbert & Whiteneck, 1976; Jourard, 1971b). Not coincidentally we think, findings reported by Pederson and Higbee (1969) and Shapiro et al. (1976) suggest that disclosers attribute a variety of relationally-relevant qualities to their targets (e.g., warmth, understanding, friendliness, genuineness and closeness).

This research suggests that the degree of intimacy of a message manifested on the content level meta-communicates about the relational level by virtue of the fact that the content can be identified as "intimate." That is, the level of intimacy at which individuals discuss an issue, as well as the issues chosen for discussion, indicates the way in which they view the relationship. In essence, the disclosing of intimate information defines the relationship as intimate (from the discloser's point of view, at least).

"Dyadic effect" studies (Jourard, 1971a) provide the strongest evidence for relational definition at the content level, in general, and for the operation of relational control through self-disclosure specifically. The existence of the norm of reciprocity or dyadic effect has been documented by many researchers using a variety of subject populations (cf. Jourard, 1959; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Jourard & Richman, 1963). For example, Weigel et al.'s (1969) subjects

were not willing to initiate new self-disclosure to persons to whom they had previously self-disclosed; however, they were likely to reciprocate disclosure from those persons. Derlega, Wilson and Chaikin (1976) concluded that the best predictor of the level of intimacy that B will use when disclosing to A is the level of intimacy with which A initiated the communication. Chittick and Himelstein (1971) have demonstrated that subjects' quantity and intimacy of disclosure can be manipulated so that it conforms to standards of behavior set by experimental confederates. Although most of these authors imply that the dyadic effect is mutual, Davis' (1976) findings suggest that a process of role differentiation within dyads takes place in which one partner assumes relatively independent responsibility for level of intimacy and the other takes her/his cue accordingly. In an earlier study by Jourard and Resnick (1970), similar results were reported; the less-disclosing partner took a more following, reciprocating role, while the more-disclosing partner assumed the leading role. There is, in fact, no firm evidence that the more-disclosing members of dyads engage in any reciprocation at all (also see Pearce, Wright, Sharp & Slama, 1974, on this point).

Davis' (1976) and Jourard and Resnick's (1970) findings lend support to our contention that self-disclosure is not only the substance (content level) of messages, but is also a relational-level control strategy. As such, self-disclosure influences future interactions between participants, a fact which is important when considering relational control.

Self-disclosure as Relational Control

As discussed earlier, interactants define their relative positions during an interaction through their selection of various relational control strategies. The interactants may be "one-up," "one-down," or symmetrical relative to one another. Sluzki and Beavin (1977) suggest that these positions are mutually

exclusive and exhaustive. Considering these as they relate to self-disclosure, what then becomes of the positioning of the interactants? That is, if A discloses to B, is A one-up, one-down, or symmetrical with respect to B? There are two reasons to suggest that B takes the one-up position, and two reasons to suggest that A takes the one-up position, when A discloses to B.

First, if A discloses to B, it might be said that B is one-up because A makes himself relatively vulnerable and allows B to be dominant in the sense that B now has information which can be used against A.

Second, with regard to assumptions concerning the norm of reciprocity, this same conclusion, that B is one-up, is feasible. The norm of reciprocity suggests that if A discloses to B, B is then "obligated" to reciprocate that disclosure. Based on this A will remain one-down until B has reciprocated. Thus dominance will vary with exchange and with level of intimacy. However, for each level of intimacy, dominance must be re-established. That is, if A discloses information to B and B reciprocates, the interactants are equal; if A then discloses more intimate information, B is again in the dominant position and must reciprocate at the same level before equality is again established.

Based on the norm of reciprocity, a third conclusion is drawn: if A discloses, A is one-up. The obligation forced on B to reciprocate places A in the dominant position in that A is able to elicit information from B.

Fourth, the above conclusion (i.e., A is one-up) is also reasonable based on Davis' (1976) theorizing about the norm of reciprocity. As mentioned above, he speculates that reciprocal disclosure is in fact not mutual but asymmetrical, with one partner taking a leading role and the other a following role. Although the one taking the leading role is claimed to be the high discloser, this does not suggest that s/he is engaging in any reciprocation at all. Rather, this member sets the pace for disclosure with the following

member engaging in the reciprocation. Again A would be considered dominant, in the sense that s/he controls or leads B's disclosure.

These various conclusions are not to suggest that the norm of reciprocity will be the basis for inferences about self-disclosure and control in all contexts. It is important to note that situations exist where self-disclosure may occur but the norm of reciprocity does not operate. For instance in a doctor-patient relationship, the doctor is in no way obligated to reciprocate the patient's disclosures. Furthermore, what of relational escalation? As discussed earlier, Altman and Taylor (1973) suggest that it is a function of self-disclosure. The individual aware of this can strategically move the relationship to more intimate levels (Knapp, 1978). This maneuver would place the discloser in a dominant position and is a clear example of the use of self-disclosure as a relational control strategy.

Research Questions

When taken separately, the self-disclosure literature and the control literature describe separate, but not necessarily competing or contradictory, ways in which relationships can be characterized. It seems unreasonable that relational development (in terms of intimacy) procedes independently from relational control. The self-disclosure literature leads us to believe that, in fact, divulged intimacies may be used as control strategies and may be characterized (or coded) in the same manner as structural and paralinguistic control strategies.

Our central concern, then, is: will self-disclosive messages and transactions exhibit characteristic relational control patterns? Our review of literature directed our attention to three specific research questions:

1) Will an intimate self-disclosive message be consistently cast into a particular control position?

2) Will a self-disclosive message be consistently and immediately preceded by a particular control move? (That is, do one or more control moves elicit self-disclosure?)

3) Will a transaction involving an intimate message be characterized by a particular type of symmetry or complementarity?

Method

Subjects. Participants in this research were seven conjugal dyads selected at random from the local telephone directory. Participation in the study was solicited and meeting times were established by telephone contact.

Procedures. Participants were audio-tape recorded for twenty minutes in their homes while discussing two questions provided by the researcher:[2]

a) Name three married couples who are mutual friends of yours. As a couple, decide which of the couples you name is the most happily married and why.

b) You have just received a $1000 gift. I would like you to decide as a couple how to spend this money. The ideas about purchases must not involve things you are planning to buy now. You must spend all of the money.

The couples were given one question at a time and allowed ten minutes of uninterrupted discussion for each question. Discussions were audio taped, but the researcher was not present. Order of presentation of questions was counter-balanced. The audio tapes were professionally transcribed and the transcripts were verified by two research assistants working together.

Coding. Rogers-Millar's (1979) Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme, the most well-developed system for the structural analysis of

transactions, was used to describe messages in terms of control direction. In the Rogers-Millar system each message is categorized by speaker, "grammatical form" and "response mode," and is given the appropriate three-digit code. The grammatical (syntactic) forms which a message may take include assertion, question, talk-over and noncomplete. The response mode includes the categories of support, nonsupport, extension, answer, instruction, order, disconfirmation, topic change and initiation-termination. These individual message codes are then translated into one-up (↑), one-down (↓) or one-across (→) moves. Finally, message control directions may be combined into sequential pairs to form transactional patterns of symmetry, transition and complementarity. A brief sample of coded interaction might look like the following:

Speaker	Message Code	Transaction Code
1 Wife: We don't do anything together anymore.	119↑	
		↑↓
2. Husband: What do you mean?	223↓	

A system for coding self-disclosure, comparable to the Rogers-Millar system, was not available, so one was designed for this study. It is briefly described below; for a more detailed explication, including definition of categories and pilot test data, see Widenmann (1980).

The scheme lends itself to the examination of three dimensions of self-disclosure: personalness (level of intimacy), valence (positiveness or negativeness of the information), and appropriateness. Each message is given

a five-digit code: digit one = speaker, digit two = self-disclosure (1 = yes or 2 = no), digit three = personalness (1 = low, 2 = moderate, 3 = high), digit four = valence (1 = positive, 2 = negative, 3 = neutral), digit five = appropriateness (1 = appropriate, 2 = inappropriate). A sample of coded interaction might look like the following:

		CODE
Speaker 1:	(exam in hand) " . . . 29 out of a 100. That stuff goes over my head; I think I have some sort of block against it or something. Actually, though, I'm not doing too well in my other courses either. I don't dig school at all . . . I have."	11221
Speaker 2:	"Yeah, I know what you mean. Actually, I like school; it's just that it's really hard for me to get good grades."	21231

The translation of the code given to Speaker #1's first message: appropriate, moderate, negative disclosure. (Valence and appropriateness data are not concerns of this study and will not be discussed.)

Self-disclosure and relational control were coded independently by coders trained in the use of one of the schemes and blind to the purpose of the study.

Reliability. Inter- and intra-coder reliability was assessed by a message-by-message comparison for agreement between the original coding and a recoding of ten percent of the transcripts. For relational control, intercoder reliability was estimated to be .81, within the range (.79 to 1.00) reported by Millar, Rogers-Millar and Courtright (1979) for this coding scheme.

Intra-coder reliability was also estimated to be .81.

For self-disclosure, reliability estimates were: intercoder, .82; intra-coder, .77. Original codes were used for analysis and no attempt was made to reconcile discrepancies between coders.

Results

Self-disclosive messages were summed across dyads and arrayed in contingency tables based on intimacy and control direction. Research questions were answered by converting observed cell frequencies to z-scores. These scores were then compared to cumulative normal probabilities (Hays, 1973, Table 1). Alpha was set at .05.

In regard to Question 1, the discloser of an intimate message assumes a one-up position ($z = 6.121$, $p < .00001$; see Table 1). That is, the self-disclosive statement is characterized by a one-up move in terms of its structural and/or paralinguistic properties. At the relational level these subjects attempt to assert definitional rights (Rogers-Millar & Millar, 1979) while on the content level indicate that the definition they seek is "intimate." Based on Davis' (1976) theorizing about the norm of reciprocity, we would expect people engaging in self-disclosure to take a one-up position if they are "leading"--i.e., setting the standard for appropriate level of disclosure.

An examination of the control characterization of messages immediately preceding self-disclosure (Question 2) revealed that both one-up and one-down messages typically precede self-disclosures. One hundred and six (see rows 1, 4 and 7 in Table 2) of the 275 self-disclosures were preceded by one-up messages ($z = 1.95$, $p < .0125$), while 119 (see rows 2, 5 and 8 in Table 2) were preceded by one-down messages ($z = 3.62$, $p < .0002$).

Closer analysis reveals that when self-disclosure is intimate, the preceding message is one-up ($z = 2.757$, $p = .0013$). When the self-disclosure

is non-intimate, the preceding message is one-down ($z = 3.745$, $p = .00004$). Equally important is that one-across messages do not typically elicit self-disclosure, a finding consistent with the "neutral" nature of such messages.

When person A sends a one-up message, s/he may be seen as attempting to elicit an intimate self-disclosure from B, while at the same time asserting a definition of the relationship. If, through this asserted definition, A has indicated that the relationship be defined as intimate, then B's disclosive response confirms A's definition.

In the case of a one-down control move preceding self-disclosure, A is requesting a definition of the relationship by making the one-down move. In response to this message, B engages in a less risky (non-intimate) self-disclosure as a means of defining the relationship. The act of self-disclosing may still be considered a sign of intimacy, but it is a more cautious response to A's non-committal preceding message.

Question 3 asked if a transaction involving an intimate message would be characterized by a particular type of symmetry or complementarity. Competitive symmetry ($z = 7.72$, $p < .00001$) and one-down complementarity ($z = 2.016$, $p = .0111$) typify the intimate transaction. Characterization by competitive symmetry suggests the following: Person A attempts to assert a definition of the relationship and B responds by asserting a definition at both the content and relational levels. B's attempt to define the relationship at the relational level is evidenced by a one-up control move. At the content level B is again asserting a definition of the relationship by engaging in self-disclosure and thereby suggesting that the relationship is in some way intimate.

This finding, when considered along with the fact that one-up messages precede self-disclosures, also raises some questions about the nature of the interact sequence ↑↑, usually called competitive symmetry. These data do not suggest competition at all. Rather, a forceful and unambiguous affirmation of

the intimacy level of the relationship, along with the possibility of escalation of that level, appears to be what is being communicated. Such an interpretation is consistent with the role that self-disclosure plays in relational development.

One-down complementarity also typifies the intimate transaction. Here A makes a one-down move, thus requesting that B assert a definition of the relationship. The definitional assertion at the relational level is evidenced by engagement in self-disclosure--an indication that the assumption of control is not to be construed as a threat to A, and that the relationship is still intimate.

Summary and Implications

The findings reported here offer a first glimpse of how relational control messages function in consort with message content to define relationships. Since self-disclosure is typified by a one-up direction, it is reasonable to conclude that it is available as a control strategy to participants in a relationship. Since participants in this study were already in long-term intimate relationships, and the data were gathered in only one session, it is impossible to do anything more than speculate about relational development here. But this reading of the data suggests how self-disclosure is used in relational development.

The strategic use of self-disclosure as a relational marker is also evidenced by the fact that it was used differentially in response to messages with different control directions. One-up messages preceded intimate disclosures; one-down messages preceded non-intimate disclosures; and one-across messages did not precede disclosive statements.

The manner in which one-up messages are used calls into question the usual interpretation of one-up/one-up (↑↑) message sequences as competitive. It seems that such sequences function in conjugal dyads as affirmation and/or escalation of intimacy.

It is clear to us that future considerations of relational control must be cognizant of the content of the interaction as well as the structure. If future research supports our conclusions about self-disclosure as a relational control strategy, then it must be accounted for in any description or characterization of dyads in terms of control.

Footnotes

[1]It is important to note that, while control maneuvers are typically associated with one-up moves, other moves may be equally controlling. For example, individuals transmitting one-down messages may be forcing their partners to respond in a one-up manner. Therefore, following Rogers-Millar and Millar (1979), "dominance" rather than control will be used here to designate the transmission and acceptance of a one-up message.

[2]The data reported here were gathered as part of a larger study of decision-making in marital dyads. Our procedures were designed to meet the demands of that study.

REFERENCES

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. Social penetration. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Brown, R. Social psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Chittick, B. V. & Himelstein, B. The manipulation of self-disclosure. Journal of Psychology, 1967, 65, 117-121.

Cozby, P. C. Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79, 73-79.

Davis, J. D. Self-disclosure in an acquaintance exercise: Responsibility for level of intimacy. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 33, 787-792.

Davis, M. S. Intimate relations. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Derlega, V. J., Wilson, M. & Chaikin, A. L. Friendship and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 578-588.

Fitzgerald, M. P. Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 1963, 56, 405-412.

Gilbert, S. J. & Whiteneck, G. G. Toward a multidimensional approach to the study of self-disclosure. Human Communication Research, 1976, 2, 347-355.

Gouldner, A. W. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 161-178.

Hays, W. L. Statistics for the social sciences, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Jourard, S. M. Self-disclosure and other cathexis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 428-431.

Jourard, S. M. The transparent self, rev. ed. New York: Van Nostrand, 1971.(a)

Jourard, S. M. The experimental investigation of the transparent self. New York: Wiley, 1971. (b)

Jourard, S. M. & Landsman, N. J. Cognition, cathexis and the dyadic effect in man's self-disclosing behavior. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6, 178-186.

Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.

Jourard, S. M. & Resnick, J. Some affects of self-disclosure among college women. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1970, 10, 84-93.

Jourard, S. M. & Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.

Knapp, M. L. Social intercourse: From greeting to goodbye. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Mark, R. A. Coding communication at the relationship level. Journal of Communication, 1971, 21, 221-232.

Millar, F. E. & Rogers, E. A. A relational approach to interpersonal communication. In G. Millar (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication, Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1976.

Millar, F. E., Rogers-Millar, L. E. & Courtright, J. A. Relational control and dyadic understanding: An exploratory predictive regression model. Communication Yearbook, 3, 1979, 213-224.

Pearce, W. B., Wright, P. H., Sharp, S. M., & Slama, K. M. Affection and reciprocity in self-disclosing communication. Human Communication Research, 1974, 1, 5-14.

Pederson, D. M. & Higbee, K. L. Self-disclosure and relation to target person. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1969, 15, 213-220.

Rogers, L. E. & Farace, R. V. Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. Human Communication Research, 1975, 3, 229-239.

Rogers-Millar, L. E. Relational communication control coding manual. Unpublished paper, Cleveland State University, 1979.

Rogers-Millar, L. E. & Millar, F. E. Domineeringness and dominance. Human Communication Research, 1979, 5, 238-246.

Schutz, W. FIRO: A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Shapiro, J. C., Krauss, H. & Truax, C. Therapeutic conditions of disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 290-294.

Sluzki, C. E. & Beavin, J. Symmetry and complementarity: An operational definition and a typology of dyads. In P. Watzlawick and J. Weakland (Eds.), The interactional view. Toronto: Norton, 1977.

Walker, L. S. & Wright, P. H. Self-disclosure in friendship. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1976, 42, 735-742.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H. & Jackson, D. D. Pragmatics of human communication. New York: Norton, 1967.

Widenmann, S. J. Self-disclosure and relational control. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of California, Santa Barbara, 1980.

Wright, P. H. Toward a theory of friendship based on conceptualization of self. Human Communication Research, 1978, 4, 196-207.

		Intimate	Non-intimate	Sum
Direction of Relational Control Move	One-up	57	115	172
	One-down	19	46	65
	One-across	14	24	38
		90	185	

Table 1
Frequency of intimate and non-intimate self-disclosure messages by control move.

		Intimate	Non-intimate	Sum
Direction of Relational Control Moves of Paired Messages	↑↑	33	46	79
	↓↑	16	49	65
	→↑	8	20	28
	↑↓	4	14	18
	↓↓	12	23	35
	→↓	3	9	12
	↑→	5	4	9
	↓→	6	13	19
	→→	3	7	10

Table 2
Frequency of self-disclosive messages by control move and control move of preceding message.